

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: SORKIN, Felix L.

SERIAL NO.: 10/688,186

ART UNIT: 3635

FILED: October 20, 2003

EXAMINER: Bergeron, R. C.

TITLE: INTERSECTIONAL REINFORCING BAR SUPPORT WITH C-SHAPED CLAMPS

Amendment C: REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendments, previous Claims 36 - 42 have been canceled and new Claims 44 and 43 substituted therefor. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the forgoing amendments and present remarks, is respectfully requested. The present amendments have been entered for the purpose of placing the application into a proper condition for allowance.

In the Official Action, it was indicated that Claims 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(b) as anticipated by the Young patent. Claims 36 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Young patent in view of the Leonardis patent. Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Young patent in view of the Leonardis patent and further in view of the Hardy patent. Importantly, it is indicated that Claims 41 and 42 were “objected to” as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s prior art rejections, Applicant is desirous of securing patent protection for the present invention at an early date. As such, Applicant has placed those “objected to” claims into a proper independent form so as to place the application into a proper condition for allowance.

In particular, new independent Claim 43 incorporates the limitations of previous independent Claim 39, along with the limitations of objected-to Claim 41 and the limitations of intervening Claim 40. As such, independent Claim 43 should now be in a proper condition for allowance.

New independent Claim 44 incorporates the limitations of objected-to Claim 42, along with the limitations of base Claim 39. As such, independent Claim 44 should now be in a proper condition for allowance.

Based upon the foregoing analysis, applicant contends that independent Claims 43 and 44 are now in a proper condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections, in light of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested. Since no new claims have been added above those originally paid for, no additional fee is required.

Respectfully submitted,

May 11, 2007

Date

Customer No. 24106

/Andrew W. Chu/

John S. Egbert; Reg. No. 30,627

Andrew W. Chu; Reg. No. 46,625

Egbert Law Offices

412 Main Street, 7th Floor

Houston, Texas 77002

(713)224-8080

(713)223-4873 fax